

BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER

**21ST SPACE WING INSPECTION
CHECKLIST 10-1**



1 AUGUST 2000

Operations

OPERATIONS STAN/EVAL (WING/GROUP/UNIT)

NOTICE: This publication is available digitally on the AFDPO WWW site at <http://afpubs.hq.af.mil/>.

OPR: 21 OG/OGV (MSgt D. McGlamery)
Supersedes: N/A

Certified by: 21 OG/OGV (Lt Col G. Wilson)
Pages: 6
Distribution: F

This checklist reflects 21st Space Wing requirements for Operations Standardization and Evaluation Programs for AFSPC Space Operations at wing, group and unit levels to prepare for and conduct internal reviews.

SUMMARY OF REVISIONS

None. This checklist is a 1st edition new publication.

1. References have been provided for each inspection item. Critical items have been kept to a minimum, and are related to public law, safety, security, fiscal responsibility, mission accomplishment, and/or HHQ requirements. Asterisked critical items (if present) are those items that if not accomplished in support of primary mission could result in an overall Wing/Group/Unit assessment rating of less than satisfactory.

2. This publication establishes a baseline checklist. The checklist will also be used by the Wing/Group Operations Standardization Teams (OST) during applicable assessments. Use the checklist at **Attachment 1** as a guide only. Add to or modify each area as needed to ensure an effective and thorough review of a unit's Standardization and Evaluation Programs.

THOMAS D. SHEARER, Colonel, USAF
Chief of Operations

Attachment 1

OPERATIONS STAN/EVAL PROGRAMS (WING/GROUP/UNIT)

Table A1.1. Checklist.

SECTION 1: WING/GROUP			
MISSION STATEMENT: Establish policy, basic requirements and provide guidance for unit standardization and evaluation programs.			
NOTE: All references are from AFSPCI36-2202S21SW, unless otherwise noted.			
1.1. GENERAL (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS)	YES	NO	N/A
1.1.1. Do OST members complete the OST training program? (para 1.1.4.2.5.)			
1.1.2. Does the Group Commander provide the unit with a formal OST inspection report? (para 1.1.4.2.9.)			
1.1.3. Does OSS and/or OGV provide an assessment of changes and potential impacts to subordinate units for new or changed publications? (para 1.2.9.2.)			
1.1.4. Does Wing Chief of Operations review unit requests for waivers to HHQ instructions and forward requests with recommendations to 14 AF/OV and HQ AFSPC/DOT? (para 1.2.9.10.1.)			
1.1.5. Do Group Commanders coordinate and recommend approval/disapproval for unit waiver requests to HHQ instructions and supplements to the Wing Chief of Operations? (para 1.2.9.11.3.)			
1.1.6. Does OGV provide guidance to units in developing, controlling, and administering standardization and evaluation programs, as directed by AFSPCI36-2202 and applicable supplements? (para 1.2.10.11.)			
1.1.7. Does OGV ensure unit standardization/evaluation programs for new/upgraded systems are in compliance with HHQ instructions and supplements no later than the end of trial period and/or approximately no later than 15 days prior to Initial Operations Capability (IOC)? (para 1.2.10.14.)			
1.1.8. Does OGV provide the wing ECP to units? (para 4.1.3.)			
1.1.9. Does the OST conduct an annual observation of unit Chiefs of DOV during OST visits? (para 4.1.3.2.3.)			

SECTION 2: UNIT			
MISSION STATEMENT: Implement MAJCOM, NAF and Wing standardization and evaluation program.			
<i>NOTE:</i> All references are from AFSPCI36-2202S21SW, unless otherwise noted.			
2.1. EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS)	YES	NO	N/A
2.1.2. Has an annual observation of the Chief, DOV been conducted by the OST, or, if annual observation “delinquency” expired prior to a subsequent OST visit, has the Operations Officer/Det Chief determined observation requirements and documented the annual observation date on the AFSPC Form 91 for the Chief, DOV? (para 4.1.3.2.3.)			
2.1.3. Has DOV created an ERT program to emphasize necessary evaluator concepts throughout each year, with program requirements addressed in an APOI? and is at least one of the following types of training included in ERT each quarter: - A classroom or crossfeed session, which may include evaluator techniques, ISD concepts, new HHQ/local instruction requirements, documentation, recent OST visit results and similar areas. (para 4.1.3.2.1.1.1.) And/or - Practical evaluator training, which may include performance test conduct, script development, error assessment and similar items. (para 4.1.3.2.1.1.2.)			
2.1.4. Has the unit supplemented the wing ECP to address all local evaluator requirements and procedures, to include a Plan of Instruction to show the flow of training, and a local evaluator handbook to describe specific procedures for performance test construction, script presentation, simulation procedures and similar items? (para 4.1.3.)			
2.1.5. Does the unit document evaluator initial training and certification on the 21 SW Form 53? (paras 1.2.12.4.4.1, 2.6.3., 4.1.3.)			
2.2. PROGRAM MATERIALS (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS)	YES	NO	N/A
2.2.1. Has DOV created an Annual Plan of Evaluation (APOE) to determine which tasks/ subtasks will be exposed in recurring evaluations during the course of the year? (para 4.1.2.3.7.)			
2.2.2. Are all evaluation performance tests coordinated, validated, and approved prior to initial exposure to evaluatees to ensure currency, technical accuracy and standardization? (para 4.1.14.)			
2.2.3. Do all evaluation performance tests (except special evaluations), include no more than two and no less than one multiple input per scenario that are clearly labeled within each script? (para 4.1.8.1.3.1.)			

2.2.4. Are multiple inputs limited to two stimuli and comply with all presentation limitations outlined in AFSPCI36-2203V1? (para 4.1.8.1.3.1.)			
2.2.5. Has the unit developed/maintained a 21 OG/OGV approved stimuli list of all script inputs an evaluatee could possibly be exposed to during evaluations? (para 2.5.1.)			
2.3. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT (CRITICAL ITEMS)	YES	NO	N/A
2.3.1. Does the Operations Officer/Det Chief ensure all training, evaluation and procedural requirements are fulfilled before operational changes take effect? (para 2.7.1.)			
2.4. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS)	YES	NO	N/A
2.4.1. Does the unit maintain a standardization/evaluation product coordination/validation/approval process policy, and complete process to ensure program materials/documentation are current, technically/procedurally accurate, and standardized? (para 4.1.14. and 1.2.12.8.3.)			
2.4.2. Does DOV coordinate in the development of training program materials? (para 1.2.12.8.4.)			
2.4.3. Does DOV coordinate with the Operations Officer/Det Chief to determine the overall impact and necessary requirements when system, procedural or program changes affect operations? (para 2.7.)			
2.4.4. Does DOV conduct a review of all evaluation program materials at least annually to ensure currency, accuracy and standardization and are all evaluation program materials maintained for at least one year from the date they were approved? (para 4.1.15.)			
2.5. EVALUATION PROGRAMS (CRITICAL ITEMS)	YES	NO	N/A
2.5.1. When all initial evaluation script versions are combined (regardless of position), are all subtasks covered? (para 4.1.2.9.1.)			
2.5.2. When all recurring evaluation script versions are combined (regardless of position), are all subtasks covered? (para 4.1.2.9.3.)			
2.5.3. Does the unit ensure that all subtasks are actually exposed annually on recurring evals (across all positions)? (para 4.1.2.9.3.)			
2.5.4. When all upgrade evaluation script versions are combined (by position), are all tasks (not subtasks) covered? (para 4.1.2.9.2.)			
2.5.5. Are all tasks/subtasks in which major and critical errors were committed during a UQ evaluation re-evaluated in the subsequent special evaluation? (para 4.1.2.4.3.)			

2.6. EVALUATION PROGRAMS (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS)	YES	NO	N/A
2.6.1. Does the GSU conduct at least 10% of recurring evaluations (counted per individual, not per crew) as no-notice evaluations annually and are no-notice evaluations conducted at least 1 month prior to crewmember(s)' delinquency date(s)? (para 4.1.2.3.1.2.)			
2.6.2. Does the unit ensure evaluation augmentees do not have prior knowledge of what actual scenario is being presented, and do not participate in pre-scenario activities? (script scrubs, sim-switch pre-briefs, etc) (para 4.1.9.10.1.)			
2.7. DOCUMENTATION (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS)	YES	NO	N/A
2.7.1. Is the Operations Officer/Det Chief notified to determine additional actions if an evaluation augmentee's proficiency is in question? (paras 4.1.9.10.1. & 4.1.12.3.2.)			
2.7.2. Does the unit document exercise related deficiencies via MFR, and forward the MFR to the Unit Commander or Operations Officer within three workdays for possible corrective actions? (para 4.1.12.3.5.)			
2.7.3. Are real-world deficiencies that occur during an evaluation annotated as part of the evaluation (evaluation error), and used to assess the overall rating? (para 4.1.13.2.5.)			
<p>2.7.4. Are all items specified in Attachment 7 of AFSPCI 36-2202 documented on the 14 AF Form 6, Corrective Action Worksheet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unit CC/DO/Det Chief decisions, directed training/evaluations, restricted status, initials, and date? (para 1.2.12.4.5.3. and 4.1.13.2.4.) - All initial, upgrade, recurring, and special evals directed following IT (even if no errors were assessed)? (para 4.1.13.2.) - Task, subtask, criticality, deficiency code, reference, a brief description, impact, actions taken (if required), and other pertinent information ? (para 4.1.13.2.5.) 			
<p>2.7.5. Are all evaluation/certification documentation items specified in Attachment 10 of AFSPCI36-2202 annotated on the AFSPC Form 91? (paras 2.4. and 4.1.2.4.4.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CMR/BMR Cert/Decert/Recert (date, position, reason for Decert) - Evaluator Cert/Decert (date) - Placement in/removal from CMR/BMR Restricted Status (date, position, reason) - CMR Evaluations (date, position, result) - BMR Observations (date, position, result) - Evaluator Annual Observations (date, observed by) - Evaluator RT (date, title, exemptions, results) - SME appointment/removal (date, position, reason) 			

2.7. TEMAP (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS)	YES	NO	N/A
2.7.1. Has the unit developed a process to track, analyze and report subtask exposures and deficiencies for initial/upgrade/recurring evaluations and real world deficiencies? (para 7.1.1.)			
2.7.2. Does DOV compile evaluation results and other applicable data to support TEMAP and are trends determined from this data? (paras 1.2.12.8.7. & 7.1.1.)			
2.7.3. Does the unit determine evaluation RAFRs solely by analysis of evaluation AFR data, and report these errors and deficiencies using the format specified in Attachment 9? (para 7.1.1.2.1.2.1.)			
2.7.4. Does the unit consider all real-world deficiencies automatic AFRs, and determine real-world deficiency RAFRs solely by analysis of real-world data? (para 7.1.1.2.1.2.2.)			
<p>2.7.5. Does the unit provide a quarterly TEMAP report to OGV as an attachment to the unit's ORP minutes that includes the following data for each identified training, evaluation and real-world AFR, and for the critical error summary (see Attch 9 & para 7.1.1.5.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Subtask Description/Number (from unit JPRL)? - Deficiency Codes (and numbers of each)? - Deficiencies and Exposures? - Deficiency Rate (%)? - Unit determination whether any RAFRs and trends exist? - Deficiency/Course of Action Summary? 			